THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE S.ANANDA REDDY

WRIT PETITION No : 16786 of 2005

Dated: 02-08-2005

-

-

Between:

Rayudu Bhadram, S/o. Appa Rao,

Aged about 60 years, R/o.Jaddangi Village,

Rajavommangi Mandal, East Godavari,

East Godavari District.

Petitioner…

And

The Government of A.P.

Rep.by its Secretary, Social Welfare Department (LTR-2), Secretariat, Hyderabad and others.

Respondents…

-

-

-

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed by the petitioner aggrieved by the action of the 1st respondent-Social Welfare Department (LTR-2) in not passing any orders on the stay petition, though he preferred revision petition on 11-07-2005 before the 1st respondent along with an application seeking stay of the orders of the 2nd respondent-Additional Agent to the Government (Project Officer), pending disposal of the revision filed before the

1st respondent.

According to the petitioner, the 3rd respondent-Special Deputy Collector, initiated proceedings in L.T.R.P.No.152 of 2002 under A.P. Scheduled Areas Land Transfer Rules 1969 and Land Transfer Regulations 1959 as amended by Act 1/70 (for short 'Regulations') on the premise that the petitioner is in possession of the entire land admeasuring Acs.4-00 situated in R.S.Nos.241/1, Acs.2.47; 241/1, Acs.0-15; 241/4, Acs.0-05, 261/1, Acs.0-51; 261/2, Acs.0-80; 283/3, Acs.0-02 of Jaddangi Village of Rajavommangi Mandal, East Godavari District in contravention of the said regulations and after conducting enquiry ordered for eviction of the petitioner, against which, petitioner preferred an appeal before the 2nd respondent and the same was dismissed on 23-10-2004. Aggrieved by the same, petitioner filed a revision before the 1st respondent. Pending the revision petition before the 1st respondent, he also sought for stay of dispossession from the schedule property, but no orders are passed on the stay petition by the 1st respondent, hence the petitioner has come up with the present writ petition.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader for Social Welfare.

In view of the pendency of the revision petition before the

1st respondent, it would be appropriate to dispose of the writ petition with a direction to the 1st respondent to dispose of the revision petition, filed by the petitioner, expeditiously, preferably within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Pending disposal of the revision petition, the respondents 4 and 5 are directed not to dispossess the petitioner from the schedule land.

The writ petition is accordingly disposed of. No order as to costs.

_____

S. ANANDA REDDY, J

Dated: 02-08-2005

LSK